

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are all of the pending claims, with claims 1, 9 and 17 being written in independent form.

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 2, 9, 10 and 17 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by US 4,380,785 to Demeyer et al., (“Demeyer”); and claims 3-8 and 11-16 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Demeyer. Applicants respectfully traverse all of these rejections in view of the following remarks.

A. Independent Claim I:

Independent claim 1 recites (among other things) that the controllable power semiconductor is “*connected in parallel with the tripping magnet and connected in parallel with the current supply formed by the rectifier circuit.*” An example, non-limiting embodiment of these features will be appreciated with reference to Fig. 2. As shown, the controllable power semiconductor 12 is connected in parallel with the tripping magnet 5, and connected in parallel with the output of the rectifier circuit 9, 10, 11. At least these features (as recited in claim 1), in combination with the other features recited in claim 1, are not taught or suggested by the prior art relied upon by the Examiner.

The Examiner relies heavily upon the Demeyer reference to teach each and every feature of the invention defined by claim 1. This rejection position is not convincing for the following reasons.

As an initial matter, the Examiner has not compared Demeyer to claim 1 on and *element-by-element* basis. In this regard, the Office Action is incomplete. Applicants respectfully request clarification.

Although not expressly indicated in the Office Action, Applicants believe that the Examiner compares Demeyer’s bridge transistor 56 (see Fig. 2) to the controllable power semiconductor, defined by claim 1. The bridge transistor 56 is a component part of the switch 52 depicted in Fig. 1 of the reference. As clearly shown in Fig. 1, however, the current supply is connected in *series* with the trip coil 22 and the switch 52. A disadvantage of this series connection is that the current rectifiers 24, 26, 28 may be configured more powerful because these rectifiers work against the counter voltage that decreases at the trip coil 22 and the bridge transistor 56. The structure depicted in Fig. 1 of Demeyer is in contrast to that defined by independent claim 1.

By virtue of the structure defined by claim 1, the power supply circuit may be charged with short pulses, as shown in Fig. 4, which are timed such that they do not result in triggering the trigger magnet 5. In that case, the current converters may work almost exclusively against the counter voltage of the measuring resistor 14 and the closed power semiconductor 12, which is relatively low.

As demonstrated above, independent claim 1 recites features that are practically and conceptually different than Demeyer. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the raised anticipation rejection.

B. Independent Claims 9 and 17:

Independent claims 9 and 17 are similar to claim 1 to the extent that claims 9 and 17 each recite (albeit in different formats) a parallel connection between the controllable power semiconductor and the current supply formed by the rectifier circuit. Accordingly, claims 9 and 17 are believed to be patentable for reasons analogous to those noted above with respect to claim 1.

CONCLUSION

Applicant earnestly solicits reconsideration and allowance of all of the pending claims.

Should there be any matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the telephone number of the undersigned below.

The Commissioner is authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By: _____


Ray Heflin, Reg. No. 41,060
P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

DJD/HRH:lmg